Weak values obtained from Einstein equivalence principle

Miao Zhang*[1]

[1]*Department of Physics, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu 610031, China*

(Dated: July 12, 2016)

Abstract

Quantum weak measurement, measuring some observable quantities within the selected sub-ensemble of the entire quantum ensemble, can produce many interesting results such as the superluminal phenomena. An outcome of such a measurement is the weak value which has been applied to amplify some weak signals of quantum interactions in lots of previous references. Here, we apply the weak measurement to the system of relativistic cold atoms. According to Einstein mass-energy equivalence principle (EEP), the internal energy of an atom will contribute its rest-mass and consequently the external momentum of center-of-mass. This implies a weak coupling between the internal and external degrees of freedom of atoms moving in the free space. After a duration of this coupling, a weak value can be obtained by post-selecting an internal state of atoms. We show that, the weak value can significantly change the momentum uncertainty of atoms and consequently could help us to experimentally measure the weak effects arising from EEP.

arXiv:1601.06077v2 [quant-ph] 9 Jul 2016

* zhangmiao079021@163.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Almost thirty years ago, Aharonov, Albert, and Vaidman introduced the theory of quantum weak measurement [1]. This measurement have a key feature: after a weak coupling between the quantum systems, the relevant observable quantities are measured in some post-selected sub-ensembles. An outcome of weak measurements is the so-called weak value A_w which is a complex number and depends on the post-selected state [2–4]. Physically, the pure state of a quantum system will be destroyed by the post-selection and then becomes a mixed state which is constituted by two pure states. Selecting out one of the pure states to be measured, some new phenomena appear because the selected wave function is very different from the original one (before the post-selection). The post-selection is actually a physical operation applied on the quantum state, so that the weak measurement can be regarded as a quantum coherent operation plus a classical selection (filtering). Hence, the weak measurement is indeed different from the usual measurement in physics.

In the recent refs. [5–8], novel phenomena within the weak measurements were reported, such as spin Hall effect of light [9], the Cheshire Cat [10, 11], and the superluminal phenomena [12–15]. More interestingly, lots of studies have shown that the weak measurements can be utilized to implement the signal amplifications [16–23]. In experiments, most of previous refs. use the laser to realize the desired weak measurements [24]. There, the necessary quantum interaction for weak value gain was realized via the crystal-induced coupling between the polarization and momentum of lights. Similar to the lights, the matter wave could be also applicable for realizing the desired weak measurements. Recently, this has been demonstrated in the neutron interferometry [25]. In such an experiment, an external magnetic field was applied to generate the spin-orbit coupling of neutron, and the weak value was obtained by post-selecting a spin state. Remarkable, serval other weak measurements have been proposed in the solid-state systems, see, e.g., [26, 27].

Here, we propose using weak value to test Einstein mass-energy equivalence principle (EEP) in the system of coherent atoms. Usually, the mass m in the Schrödinger or Dirac equation is treated as a constant quality. However, the EEP says that the internal energy of an particle will contribute its rest-mass. Hence, the quality m is no longer a constant but depends on the particle's internal energies. This implies a weak coupling between the internal and external degrees of freedom of particles [28–31]. The potential coupling can not be explained by the usual notation of time-dilation [32] because the rest-mass is now regarded as a quantum mechanics operator (for

the internal superposition states) [29]. The recent interesting article [28] showed that the EEP-induced coupling is perhaps an universal decoherence for quantum systems in the gravitational field. As it mentioned in ref. [29], measuring the possible dynamic coupling arising from EEP is still a challenge in experiments due to its very weak interacting strength. Here, we design a weak measurement setup for observing the ultra-weak effects of EEP. We consider a two-level atom whose internal qubit and external center-of-mass (c.m.) motion are coupled naturally due to the EEP. Based this coupling, a weak value is obtained by the post-selection of atomic internal state. We show that the present weak value could offer some certain advantages for experimentally detecting the ultra-weak signals of EEP.

This article is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly review the basic principles and the usefulness of quantum weak measurements. In Sec. III, we analyze the EEP-induced couplings between the internal and external degrees of freedom of a two-level atom. Based on this coupling, a complex weak value is obtained by post-selecting an internal state of atom. Considering the practical atomic system is in earth-based laboratory, the gravitational effect is also studied. In sec. IV, we use the atomic Kapitza-Dirac (KD) scattering to prepare the coherent atoms with large momentum uncertainty [33]. Such a light-induced scattering of atoms is further utilized to realize the desired post-selection of atomic internal states. Finally, we present our conclusions in Sec. V.

II. THE BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR QUANTUM WEAK MEASUREMENTS

Consider two interacting quantum systems, namely Alice and Bob, with the coupling Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hbar g_0 \hat{A}\hat{B}$. Here, $\hbar$ is the Planck constant divided by 2π. $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ are the operators who change respectively Alice and Bob's states. The coupling strength between the two quantum systems is g_0. After an interaction of duration t, the final state of the total system can be approximately written as

$$|\psi\rangle = e^{\frac{-i\hat{H}t}{\hbar}}|A_i\rangle|B_i\rangle \approx |A_i\rangle|B_i\rangle - ig\hat{A}\hat{B}|A_i\rangle|B_i\rangle \tag{1}$$

under the weak interaction limit $g = g_0 t \to 0$. Here, $|A_i\rangle$ and $|B_i\rangle$ are respectively the initial states of Alice and Bob, and the high orders of g have been neglected. By using two orthonormal states $|A_s\rangle$ and $|A_d\rangle$, the state (1) can be expanded by

$$|\psi\rangle = (\langle A_s|A_i\rangle)|B_s\rangle|A_s\rangle + (\langle A_d|A_i\rangle)|B_d\rangle|A_d\rangle \tag{2}$$

with the unnormalized wave functions $|B_s\rangle \approx (1 - igA_w\hat{B})|B_i\rangle$ and $|B_d\rangle \approx (1 - igA^w\hat{B})|B_i\rangle$. Here, $A_w = \langle A_s|\hat{A}|A_i\rangle/\langle A_s|A_i\rangle$ and $A^w = \langle A_d|\hat{A}|A_i\rangle/\langle A_d|A_i\rangle$ are the weak values. Numerically, when $\langle A_s|A_i\rangle \to 0$, we have $|A_w| \to \infty$ and $|A^w| \to \langle A_i|\hat{A}|A_i\rangle$.

In weak measurement, the observable qualities of Bob are measured in the post-selected subsemble of Alice's state $|A_s\rangle$, and the relevant results are given by the following equation

$$\langle\hat{M}\rangle = \frac{\langle B_s|\hat{M}|B_s\rangle}{\langle B_s|B_s\rangle} \approx \langle B_i|\hat{M}|B_i\rangle + 2g\mathrm{Im}\left(A_w M_B\right) , \tag{3}$$

with

$$M_B = \langle B_i|\hat{M}\hat{B}|B_i\rangle - \langle B_i|\hat{M}|B_i\rangle\langle B_i|\hat{B}|B_i\rangle . \tag{4}$$

Above, $\hat{M}$ is a hermitian operator of Bob. It can be seen that the g-induced effect is proportional to the imaginary part of $A_w M_B$. This indicates that the weak value could amplify the g-effect, significantly, with $|A_w| \to \infty$. It can be also found that, the Eq. (3) with $A_w = \langle A_i|\hat{A}|A_i\rangle$ just describes the usual results without of the post-selection. On quantum weak measurements, it is worth to emphasize the following three points.

(i) The post-selected state $|A_s\rangle$ is beyond the eigenstates of the system, it could be one of the coherent superposition of Alice's eigenstates. So that, the weak measurement is more general than the usual projective measurements.

(ii) The result $\langle\hat{M}\rangle$ is obtained in the post-selected sub-ensemble, it is not the conjoint-measurement $\hat{P} = \hat{M}|A_s\rangle\langle A_s|$ performed in the entire ensemble, i.e., $\langle\hat{M}\rangle \neq \langle\psi|\hat{P}|\psi\rangle$.

(iii) The observable quality $\hat{M}$ can be generalized to be $\hat{M}' = \hat{U}_2^\dagger\hat{M}\hat{U}_2$. That is, one can perform any further operations, namely $\hat{U}_2$, to the selected state $|B_s\rangle$ and then measure the observable quality $\hat{M}$. The final result is $\langle B_s|\hat{U}_2^\dagger\hat{M}\hat{U}_2|B_s\rangle/\langle B_s|B_s\rangle$.

The feature (i) carry out a question. How can a coherent superposition state be post-selected ? This has been pointed out previously, see, e.g., [34]. In principle, the post-selection operation $\langle A_s| = \langle n|\hat{R}$ can be realized by applying a coherent operation $\hat{R}$ to Alice and then post-selecting the eigenstate $|n\rangle$ via the projective measurement. For example, the desired superposition state $|A_s\rangle$ of a two-level atom (with the internal eigenstates $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$) can be post-selected by implementing a single-qubit rotation $\hat{R}$ to the atom and consequently selecting the eigenstate $|g\rangle$.

The feature (ii) carry out another question. The probability $P_s \approx |\langle A_s|A_i\rangle|^2$ for successfully post-selecting $|A_s\rangle$ decreases rapidly with the increasing $|A_w|$. Hence, the weak value amplification is applicable only for the quantum system which includes large numbers of microscopic

particles. Serval recent papers show the weak value amplification offering no fundamental metrological advantage due to the necessarily reduced probability of successful post-selection [35–37]. Aiming at the practical experimental systems, some studies show that the weak measurement can still improve the precision of parameter estimation due to the detector saturation [38] or some other systematic errors [39].

Alternatively, the advantages of weak value amplification can be simply explained by the following equation:

$$I = NP_s\langle\hat{M}\rangle + NP_sE_{\rm system} + E_{\rm random}\ . \tag{5}$$

Here, I is the experimental signal of observable quality $\langle\hat{M}\rangle$. This signal is proportional to the number NP_s of successfully post-selected particles (with N being the total number of prepared particles). In practical experiments, the system error $NP_sE_{\rm system}$ and the random error $E_{\rm random}$ will both contribute the outcome I [34]. Certainly, the random error $E_{\rm random}$ can be overcome by increasing the number of particles, i.e., $NP_s\langle\hat{M}\rangle \gg E_{\rm random}$. However, the system error can not be eliminated by increasing the particles input as it is proportional to NP_s. Hence, the weak value amplification, i.e., $\langle\hat{M}\rangle \gg E_{\rm system}$, could be useful for suppressing the system errors (when the random errors are negligible).

As it pointed out in the previous refs, e.g., [3], the imaginary part A_w^i of weak value could be more useful than the real part A_w^r. It can be also seen from Eq. (3), when $M_B =$ Real, the standard measurement (with $A_w = \langle A_i|\hat{A}|A_i\rangle =$ Real) does not work for measuring the parameter g. This implies that the imaginary weak values could reveal some new effects of g. In the following sections, we will show that the imaginary weak value can change the momentum uncertainty of an atom moving in the free space.

III. THE EEP-INDUCED WEAK VALUES

A. The dynamic evolution of a falling atom with the presence of EEP-couplings

Considering only two internal states of an atom, namely, the ground state $|g\rangle$ and the excited state $|e\rangle$. The ground and excited states describe the different internal energies, i.e., E_g and $E_e = E_g + \hbar\omega$, respectively. Here, ω is the transition frequency between the two internal levels. According to EEP, the atom have the different rest-mass for $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$, i.e., $m_g = E_g/c^2$ and $m_e = m_g + \hbar\omega/c^2$, with c being the speed of light propagating in vacuum. Together with the

external c.m. motion, the total-energy of atom can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \sqrt{c^2p^2 + (m_g + m_c)^2c^4} \\ &\approx (m_g + m_c)c^2 + \tfrac{p^2}{2(m_g+m_c)} \\ &\approx m_g c^2 + \tfrac{p^2}{2m_g} + m_c(c^2 - \tfrac{p^2}{2m_g^2}) \,, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

with $m_c = 0$ (for ground state) or $m_c = \hbar\omega/c^2$ (for excited state). Here, H is a classical Hamiltonian, $p^2 = p_x^2 + p_y^2 + p_z^2$ is the vector product of three dimensional momentum, and the terms relating to the high orders of $p^2/(m_0c + m_cc)^2$ and m_c/m_g have been neglected.

In quantum mechanics, the atom is described by a coherent superposition of the two internal states, i.e., $|A_i\rangle = \alpha|g\rangle + \beta|e\rangle$, with the probability-amplitudes α and β. Thus, the internal-state-dependent Hamiltonian should be the following operator,

$$\hat{H} = (m_g c^2 + \tfrac{\hat{p}^2}{2m_g})\hat{1} + \hbar\omega[1 - \tfrac{\hat{p}^2}{2(m_g c)^2}]|e\rangle\langle e| \,, \tag{7}$$

with $\hat{1} = |g\rangle\langle g| + |e\rangle\langle e|$ and $\hat{p}^2 = \hat{p}_x^2 + \hat{p}_y^2 + \hat{p}_z^2$. So that, the results of measurements $\langle g|\hat{H}|g\rangle$ and $\langle e|\hat{H}|e\rangle$ can satisfy the classical ones of Eq. (6). By neglected the term $m_g c^2\hat{1}$ (which does not generate any effects in the present work), the Hamiltonian (7) reduces to

$$\hat{H} = \hbar\omega|e\rangle\langle e| + \left(1 - \frac{\hbar\omega|e\rangle\langle e|}{mc^2}\right)\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} \,. \tag{8}$$

Here, we denote m_g by m for short (as it will be frequently used in the follows). Obviously, the EEP-induced coupling $|e\rangle\langle e|\hat{p}^2$ between the internal electronic state and external c.m. motion of atom depends basically on the parameter

$$g_0 = \frac{\hbar\omega}{mc^2} \,, \tag{9}$$

i.e., a ratio between the energy of photon and the rest-energy of atom (in ground-state). Such a ratio is very small, so that the relevant interactions are negligible in the usual experiment systems. For example, $g_0 \approx 8\times10^{-12}$ for the calcium atom, with mass $m \approx 6.7\times10^{-26}$ Kg and the selected optical transition frequency $\omega \approx 4.6 \times 10^{14}$ Hz. In the follows, we suggest using the weak value to measure such an ultra-small parameter.

Note that, the gravity effect of neutral atoms is significant in earth-based laboratory. So that, the above Hamiltonian should be generalized to be

$$\hat{H} = \hbar\omega|e\rangle\langle e| + (1 - g_0|e\rangle\langle e|)\,\frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + (1 + g_0|e\rangle\langle e|)\,m\bar{g}\hat{z} \,. \tag{10}$$

Here, the last term is due to the gravitational potential of atom, and $\bar{g}$ is the magnitude of gravitational acceleration on earth. The coupling of $|e\rangle\langle e|\hat{z}$ is due to the so-called Einstein's weak equivalence principle, i.e., the internal energy $\hbar\omega$ will also contribute the gravitational potentials to atom. In fact, the Hamiltonian (10) describes a falling object with the different rest-masses which are internal state dependent. The different rest-masses (or say the different objects) will lead to the different diffraction patterns in the process of falling. Some more detailed studies on the EEP-induced couplings can be seen in the previous refs. [28–30]. In this work, we do not measure the gravity effects. However, the relevant studies on Hamiltonian (10) is necessary, because our suggested measurements for coupling $|e\rangle\langle e|\hat{p}^2$ are implemented in the earth-based laboratory.

In terms of g_0-couplings, we rewrite Hamiltonian (10) as

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 - g_0\hat{H}_{rc} - g_0\hat{H}_{zc}\,, \tag{11}$$

with a decoupled Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = \hbar\omega|e\rangle\langle e| + \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + m\bar{g}\hat{z}\,. \tag{12}$$

This Hamiltonian is well known, describing a falling atom without any couplings. The last two terms in Eq. (11) describe the g_0-couplings, by the horizontal directional Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{rc} = \frac{\hat{p}_x^2 + \hat{p}_y^2}{2m}|e\rangle\langle e| \tag{13}$$

and the vertical Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{zc} = \left(\frac{\hat{p}_z^2}{2m} - m\bar{g}\hat{z}\right)|e\rangle\langle e|\,. \tag{14}$$

Using Hamiltonian (11), the Schrödinger equation $i\hbar\partial_t|\psi\rangle = \hat{H}|\psi\rangle$ can be rewritten as $i\hbar\partial_t|\psi'\rangle = \hat{H}_{\rm int}|\psi'\rangle$ with an interacting Hamiltonian of

$$\hat{H}_{\rm int} = -g_0 e^{\frac{i\hat{H}_0 t}{\hbar}}(\hat{H}_{rc} + \hat{H}_{zc})e^{\frac{-i\hat{H}_0 t}{\hbar}}\,. \tag{15}$$

Above, $|\psi\rangle = \exp\left(-i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar\right)|\psi'\rangle$ is the time-dependent state of atom, and $|\psi'\rangle$, the atom's state in interacting picture, will be resolved by the Schrödinger equation with Hamiltonian (15). We note that, the unitary transformation $\hat{U}_0 = \exp\left(-i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar\right)$ does not generate coupling between the atomic internal and external degrees of freedom, and therefore the key question is to solve the state $|\psi'\rangle$. Indeed, to give an exactly resolved-result of $|\psi'\rangle$ is rather difficult due to the presence of gravitational potentials in $\hat{H}_0$ and $\hat{H}_{zc}$. However, the question can be greatly simplified if one use the weak measurement theory, i.e., considering only the effects from the linear g_0.

According to the commutation relation $[\hat{H}_0,\ \hat{H}_{rc}] = 0$, Eq. (15) reduces to

$$\hat{H}_{\rm int} = -g_0\hat{H}_{rc} - g_0 e^{\frac{i\hat{H}_0 t}{\hbar}}\hat{H}_{zc}e^{\frac{-i\hat{H}_0 t}{\hbar}}\,, \tag{16}$$

and where the last term can be expanded by the well-known form of

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\frac{i\hat{H}_0 t}{\hbar}}\hat{H}_{zc}e^{\frac{-i\hat{H}_0 t}{\hbar}} &= \hat{H}_{zc} + \tfrac{it}{\hbar}[\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_{zc}] + \tfrac{1}{2!}\left(\tfrac{it}{\hbar}\right)^2[\hat{H}_0,[\hat{H}_z,\hat{H}_{zc}]] + \cdots \\ &= \hat{H}_{zc} - \bar{g}t\left(2\hat{p}_z - m\bar{g}t\right)|e\rangle\langle e| \\ &= \hat{H}'_{zc}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Consequently, the interacting Hamiltonian (16) reads $\hat{H}_{\rm int} = -g_0(\hat{H}_{rc} + \hat{H}'_{zc})$ with a time-dependent Hamiltonian $\hat{H}'_{zc}$ in z direction.

Using the Dyson evolution operator

$$\hat{U} = 1 + \frac{-i}{\hbar}\int_0^t \hat{H}_{\rm int}dt + \left(\frac{-i}{\hbar}\right)^2\int_0^t \hat{H}_{\rm int}\int_0^{t_1}\hat{H}_{\rm int}dt_2dt_1 + \cdots\,, \tag{18}$$

we have the time-dependent state

$$|\psi'\rangle = \hat{U}|\psi_i\rangle = \left[1 + \frac{ig_0}{\hbar}\left(\hat{H}_{rc}t + \int_0^t \hat{H}'_{zc}dt\right) + \mathcal{O}(g_0)\right]|\psi_i\rangle\,. \tag{19}$$

Here, the high orders of $\hat{H}_{\rm int}$ (i.e, the high orders of g_0) have been neglected. $|\psi_i\rangle = |i\rangle|A_i\rangle$ is the initial state of atom, with the internal $|A_i\rangle$ and the external $|i\rangle = |\phi_x\rangle|\phi_y\rangle|\phi_z\rangle$. Transforming back to the Schrödinger picture, the state reads

$$|\psi\rangle = \hat{U}_0|\psi'\rangle = \hat{U}_0\left[1 + \frac{ig_0t}{\hbar}\hat{H}_{\rm eff}|e\rangle\langle e| + \mathcal{O}(g_0)\right]|\psi_i\rangle, \tag{20}$$

with

$$\hat{H}_{\rm eff} = \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} - \hat{G}\,, \tag{21}$$

and where $\hat{G} = m\bar{g}\hat{z} + \hat{p}_z\bar{g}t - m(\bar{g}t)^2/3$. These equations indicate that the kinetic energy and the gravitational potential of atom will both contribute the entanglement between the internal and external degrees of freedom. However, there is no directly coupling (such as $\hat{p}_x^2\hat{z}$ and $\hat{p}_x^2\hat{p}_z$) between the external c.m. motions for the linear g_0. This will greatly simplify our calculation.

B. The weak values due to the post-selection of atomic internal states

Based on the entangled state (20), we post-select an internal state $|A_s\rangle$, then the external motion collapses on the state of an unnormalized form of

$$\begin{aligned}|f\rangle &= \langle A_s|\psi\rangle \\ &= \left[\langle A_s|\hat{U}_0|A_i\rangle + \tfrac{ig_0t}{\hbar}\langle A_s|\hat{U}_0|e\rangle\langle e|A_i\rangle\hat{H}_{\rm eff} + \mathcal{O}(g_0)\right]|i\rangle \\ &= \langle A_s|A_i'\rangle\hat{V}_t\left[1 + \tfrac{iA_wg_0t}{\hbar}\hat{H}_{\rm eff} + \mathcal{O}(g_0)\right]|i\rangle \\ &= \langle A_s|A_i'\rangle\hat{V}_t\left[1 + \tfrac{iA_wg_0t}{2m\hbar}(\hat{p}^2 - 2m\hat{G}) + \mathcal{O}(g_0)\right]|i\rangle\,.\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Here,

$$A_w = \frac{\langle A_s|e\rangle\langle e|A_i'\rangle}{\langle A_s|A_i'\rangle} \tag{23}$$

is our weak value, with $|A_i'\rangle = \exp(-i\omega t|e\rangle\langle e|)|A_i\rangle$. The operator $\hat{V}_t = \exp\{-i[\hat{p}^2/(2m) + m\bar{g}\hat{z}]t/\hbar\}$ describes the free evolution of atomic external motions in duration t. The first result from the EEP-coupling can be found in the post-selection probability,

$$P_s = |\langle A_s|\psi\rangle|^2 = |\langle A_s|A_i'\rangle|^2\left[1 - \frac{A_w^ig_0t}{m\hbar}\langle i|(\hat{p}^2 - 2m\hat{G})|i\rangle + \mathcal{O}(g_0)\right]. \tag{24}$$

Such an observable quality depends on the imaginary part of weak value, the atomic initial momentum uncertainty, and the gravitational acceleration $\bar{g}$. Certainly, P_s can be used to test the effect of g_0.

Note that, the spatial motion of the selected atoms, i.e., the state (22), also includes the information of parameter g_0. For a glance, we formally write it as $|f\rangle \approx \hat{V}_t\exp(ig_0tA_w\hat{H}_{\rm eff}/\hbar)|i\rangle$. Then, the x-directional component reads

$$|f_x\rangle \approx e^{\frac{-it_r\hat{p}_x^2}{2m\hbar}}e^{\frac{-t_i\hat{p}_x^2}{2m\hbar}}|\phi_x\rangle = \sum_{p_x}e^{\frac{-it_rp_x^2}{2m\hbar}}e^{\frac{-t_ip_x^2}{2m\hbar}}\phi(p_x)|p_x\rangle\,, \tag{25}$$

with $t_r = t(1 - g_0A_w^r)$ and $t_i = g_0tA_w^i$. Here the initial state has been written as $|\phi_x\rangle = \sum_{p_x}\phi(p_x)|p_x\rangle$ in the momentum Hilbert space, with $\phi(p_x)$ being the probability-amplitude of finding the momentum eigenstate $|p_x\rangle$. The presentation (25) clearly shows that, the real part of weak value contributes phases to the atomic momentum eigenstates. This can be regarded as a



FIG. 1: State-selectively scattering of the three-level V-type atoms. An incident Gaussian beam of atoms is scattered transversely by the standing wave of light, resulting in a large momentum uncertainty of spatially coherent atoms. The atomic KD scattering occurs within the near-resonant regime of optical transition $|g\rangle \rightleftharpoons |a\rangle$. When atoms are initially in the internal state $|e\rangle$, the scattering is negligible. This provides an effective approach to measure the qubits $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ by observing the external c.m. momentums of atoms.

time-dilation effect [40–44]. Interesting, the imaginary part of weak value can change the momentum distribution of atoms. Whatever using Eq. (22) or (24) to measure g_0, the initially large momentum uncertainty should be prepared. In the following section we will discuss the relevant issues.

IV. IMPLEMENTING WEAK MEASUREMENT BASED ON THE KAPITZA-DIRAC SCATTERING OF ATOMS

A. The state preparation

First, we briefly review the atomic KD scattering. On the one hand, it can generate the large momentum uncertainty of atoms (a necessary condition for measuring the coupling $|e\rangle\langle e|\hat{p}^2$). On the other hand, the KD scattering can be also utilized to realize the desired post-selection of atomic internal state. Note that, the KD scattering has been well studied in atoms optics [33]. It can be regarded as a position-dependent AC stark effect of atoms in the standing light wave. Here, we induce an auxiliary atomic level, namely $|a\rangle$, see Fig. 1. Within the near-resonant regime of transition $|g\rangle \rightleftharpoons |a\rangle$, the AC stark effect can be described a Hamiltonian of $\hat{H}_{ac} = -\hbar\Omega \sin^2(kx)(|a\rangle\langle a| - |g\rangle\langle g|)$. Where, k is the wave number of the applied light, $\Omega = \Omega_c^2/(\omega_l - \omega_a)$

describes the frequency shift between the selected two levels. Ω_c is the well-known resonant Rabi frequency, and $\omega_l - \omega_a$ is the detuning between the light and the transition frequency of $|g\rangle \rightleftharpoons |a\rangle$. Under the so-called Raman-Nath approximation, the atomic wave function immediately after the interaction is given by $|\mathrm{KD}\rangle = \exp[-i\hat{p}^2\tau/(2m\hbar)]\exp(-i\hat{H}_{ac}\tau/\hbar)|\psi_0\rangle$ [45]. Here, τ and $|\psi_0\rangle$ are the effective interaction time and the initial state of the system, respectively.

Considering the atomic Gaussian beam incident, i.e., the external x-directional motion is initially in the state of

$$|0\rangle = c\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-x^2}{4\Delta^2}}|x\rangle dx = c'\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{-p_x^2}{4\sigma^2}}|p_x\rangle dp_x\,. \tag{26}$$

Here, $c = (2\pi\Delta^2)^{-1/4}$ and $c' = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/4}$ are the normalized coefficients, and $|x\rangle$ and $|p_x\rangle$ are respectively the atomic position and momentum eigenstates. The quantities Δ and $\sigma = \hbar/(2\Delta)$ are the atomic position and momentum uncertainty, respectively. Obviously, the large position uncertainty corresponds to a small momentum uncertainty. If the internal state of atoms is initially in ground state $|g\rangle$, the scattered state reads [45]

$$|\mathrm{KD}\rangle = e^{-i\Omega t_0\sin^2(kx)}|0\rangle = e^{i\eta\cos(2kx)}|0\rangle\,. \tag{27}$$

In short, we have denoted $\Omega t_0/2 = \eta$ and neglected the phase $\exp[-i\hat{p}_x^2\tau/(2m\hbar)]\exp(-i\eta)$. Expanding $\exp[i\eta\cos(2kx)]$ by the bessel functions $J_n(\eta)$ of the first kind, the atomic external motion reads

$$|\mathrm{KD}\rangle = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}\phi(n)e^{i2nkx}|0\rangle\,, \tag{28}$$

with $\phi(n) = i^n J_n(\eta)$. Above, the term $\exp(i2nkx)$ acts as a momentum-displacement operator in x-direction, i.e.,

$$e^{i2nkx}|0\rangle = |n\rangle = c'\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{(p_x-2n\hbar k)^2}{4\sigma^2}}|p_x\rangle dp_x\,. \tag{29}$$

If the initial momentum uncertainty is small, i.e., $\sigma \ll \hbar k$, the states $\{|n\rangle\}$ can regarded as the orthonormal basis, i.e., $\langle n'|n\rangle = \delta_{n',n}$ (with $\delta_{n',n}$ being the Dirac-delta function). Numerically, considering the atomic position uncertainty $\Delta = 1$ μm and the wavelength $\lambda = 0.4$ μm of a visible light, we have $\hbar k/\sigma = 4\pi\Delta/\lambda \approx 31$ and $\langle 0|1\rangle = \exp[-(\hbar k)^2/(2\sigma^2)] = \exp(-480.5)$. It can be further found $\langle n'|\hat{p}_x^2|n\rangle \approx (2n\hbar k)^2\delta_{n',n}$, such that the momentum uncertainty of the scattered atoms is calculated as $\langle\phi_x|\hat{p}_x^2|\phi_x\rangle = (2\hbar k)^2\vartheta$ [45–47]. Where, the quantity $\vartheta = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} n^2 J_n^2$ can be directly computed by the numerical method, for example, $\vartheta = 50$ with $\eta = 10$.

The detection of momentum states $\{|n\rangle\}$ is similar to that of the classical particles, by directly

observing their distinguishable paths. Considering the free diffraction, we replace Eq. (28) by

$$|\phi_x\rangle = e^{\frac{-it_0\hat{p}_x^2}{2m\hbar}}|\mathrm{KD}\rangle = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}\phi(n)|\tilde{n}\rangle\,. \tag{30}$$

Here, $t_0 = \tau + \tau'$, with τ' being the time after the light driving. For the time-dependent momentum state $|\tilde{n}\rangle = \exp[-it_0\hat{p}_x^2/(2m\hbar)]|n\rangle$, its wave-packet $|\langle x|\tilde{n}\rangle|^2$ spreads with a quantity $\Delta_d = \hbar t_0/(2m\Delta)$ which is much smaller than the shift $D_n = 4n\pi\hbar t_0/(m\lambda)$ of wave-packet center (because $\Delta \gg \lambda$). Hence, the states $\{|\tilde{n}\rangle\}$ can be distinguishable in position space when the time τ' is sufficiently long, i.e., $D_n \gg \Delta + \Delta_d$. The atoms beam in momentum state $|\tilde{n}\rangle$ can be directly observed by placing a detector at the position D_n (with a collecting region $\sim \Delta + \Delta_d$). This can be seen also from lots of previous references in the field of atoms optics.

B. The post-selection

The key step of weak measurement is the post-selection. As mentioned early, the desired post-selection of internal state $|A_i\rangle$ can be realized by the following two steps. First, we perform a single-qubit rotation $\hat{R} = \exp[-i\theta(|e\rangle\langle g| + |g\rangle\langle e|)]$ to the atomic internal state by the Raman beams. The parameter θ is a controllable quantity which is proportional to the power and duration of the drivings. For simplicity, we assume that the single-qubit operations do not affect the x-directional c.m. motions. This can be realized by properly selecting the direction of laser irradiating, e.g., the y direction. Second, we use another laser to realize the KD scattering of atoms, i.e., the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{ac}$. Since the effective interaction occurs between the transition $|a\rangle \leftrightharpoons |g\rangle$, the scattering is state-selective. If the atoms are in state $|e\rangle$, there is no KD scattering. However, the atoms in state $|g\rangle$ will be scattered and consequently deviate from their original trajectory to be detected. Worth of note that, the present post-selection is similar to that of the original work [1] by Aharonov *et al*.. There, a Stern-Gerlach device is arranged to implemented the post-selection of electronic spin. It couples the spin to the orbital motion of electron. Consequently, one can select the orbital motions to realize a post-selection of the spin state. Here, we use a state-dependent KD scattering to implemented the desired post-selection of atomic internal state. Supposing the total duration of the above two operations is sufficiently short (i.e., the interaction of g_0 in this stage is negligible), the desired post-selection operation $\langle g|\hat{R}$ can be realized. For such a post-selection, the weak value reads

$$A_w = \frac{\langle g|\hat{R}|e\rangle\langle e|A_i'\rangle}{\langle g|\hat{R}|A_i'\rangle} = \frac{\beta}{\beta + ie^{i\omega t}\alpha\cot(\theta)} \tag{31}$$



FIG. 2: A flow chart of weak measurement. The pre-selection (state preparation) includes two steps, the KD scattering for atomic external state preparation and the single-qubit operation for internal superposition state generation. After a duration of g_0-coupling, the post-selection is implemented by the other single-qubit operation and KD scattering. The atomic momentum distribution of the scattered atoms depends on the parameter g_0 and the imaginary part of weak value. By comparing the intensities of the selected two atomic beams the parameter g_0 could be estimated.

with the initial state $|A_i\rangle = \alpha|g\rangle + \beta|e\rangle$. Obviously, the real or imaginary part of above weak value can be nonzero. That is, the single-qubit operations in state preparation and post-selection will change the final results of detection. Specially, if $\alpha = \beta = 1/\sqrt{2}$, $\theta = 3\pi/4$, and $\omega t \to -\pi/2$, we have $A_w^i \to \infty$. For the weak value amplification, the relevant qualities such as the durations of laser pulses should be exactly controlled in experiments liking the well-known Ramsey interferometers [33].

C. The weak value amplification

The considered weak measurement process is dramatically shown in Fig. 2. The atoms undergo the following several stages. (a) The standing light wave induced KD scattering in x-direction, (b) the single-qubit operation performed by the y-directional laser beams, (c) the g_0-couplings, (d) the post-selection implemented by the other single-qubit operation and KD scattering, and (e) the final detection. In fact, the steps (a) and (b) are that for the initial state preparations both the atomic internal and external degrees of freedom.

Regarding (30) as the external initial state of atoms, the single-qubit operation was performed to generate the desired internal state, i.e., $|g\rangle \to |A_i\rangle$. After a duration of g_0 coupling, the post-

selection was performed to the atomic internal state, resulting in state (22). Directly, putting the prepared state (30) into Eq. (22), we have

$$|f\rangle = \langle A_s|A_i'\rangle \hat{V}_t \left[1 + \frac{iA_w g_0 t}{2m\hbar}(\hat{p}^2 - 2m\hat{G})\right] |\phi_y\rangle|\phi_z\rangle \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(n)|\tilde{n}\rangle \,. \tag{32}$$

Under the approximation $\langle\tilde{n}'|\hat{p}_x^2|\tilde{n}\rangle = \langle n'|\hat{p}_x^2|n\rangle \approx (2n\hbar k)^2\delta_{n',n}$, the probability of finding the momentum state $|\tilde{n}\rangle$ is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} P_n &= P_s \tfrac{|\langle\tilde{n}|f\rangle|^2}{\langle f|f\rangle} = |\langle\tilde{n}|f\rangle|^2 \\ &= |\langle A_s|A_i'\rangle|^2 J_n^2 \left\{1 - \tfrac{g_0 t A_w^i}{m\hbar}\left[(2n\hbar k)^2 + \langle yz\rangle\right]\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Here, the post-selection probability P_s is induced, i.e., our statistics is based on the entire atoms ensemble. The term $\langle yz\rangle = \langle i|\hat{V}_t^\dagger(\hat{p}_y^2 + \hat{p}_z^2 - 2m\hat{G})\hat{V}_t|i\rangle$ refers to y and z directional motions. Its contribution for Eq. (33) is small because momentum uncertainties in y and z directions are not enhanced. Due to the limited interaction time t, e.g., $t = 0.4$ ms, the contribution from the gravity is also negligible. Therefore, the Eq. (33) can be reduced as

$$P_n = |\langle A_s|A_i'\rangle|^2 J_n^2 (1 - g_0\omega_k t n^2 A_w^i) \,, \tag{34}$$

by neglected the term $\langle yz\rangle$. Where, $\omega_k = 4\hbar k^2/m$. The above equation indicates that the imaginary part of weak value will change the momentum distribution of the post-selected atoms. This provides us an alternative approach to measure the parameter g_0. As we mentioned early, the post-selection probability P_s is also an effective measurement for the parameter g_0, if the number N of the input atoms is precise. Similarly, by neglected the contribution from y and z directional motions, we have

$$P_s = |\langle A_s|A_i'\rangle|^2 (1 - g_0\omega_k t\vartheta A_w^i) \,, \tag{35}$$

which satisfies the normalized condition $\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} P_n = P_s$.

The usefulness of weak value is significant: it can amplify g_0 signal with the respective of backgrounds [i.e., the first terms in Eqs. (34) and (35)]. Generally, the output of an atom-detector can be described by the equation $I_n = (N + \xi_s)P_n + (N + \xi_s)\xi_d P_n + \varepsilon$. Here, ξ_s is an uncertainty of input atoms (namely, the source-noise), ξ_d denotes the uncertainty of detection efficiency (such as the detector saturation). In other words, ξ_d is the noise which is proportional to the amount of received atoms. ε denotes the dark-counting which is N independent. A single atom can be easily observed by the its resonance fluorescence, so that the dark-counting ε is negligible. The main

noises in the atoms system are ξ_s and ξ_d. Using the weak value amplification, the background-induced noises, e.g., $N|\langle A_s|A_i'\rangle|^2\xi_d$, will be significantly suppressed.

Comparing to post-selection probability P_s, the momentum distribution P_n of the post-selected atoms is more useful for suppressing the source-noise. One can use two detectors to measure such a distribution, for example,

$$\frac{I_n}{I_0}=\frac{(1+\xi_{1d})P_n}{(1+\xi_{2d})P_0}\approx(1+\xi_{1d}-\xi_{2d})\left(1-g_0\omega_k tn^2A_w^i\right)\frac{J_n^2}{J_0^2}\,. \tag{36}$$

Where, the source-noise (and the term $|\langle A_s|A_i'\rangle|^2$) has been completely eliminated, and $(1+\xi_{1d})/(1+\xi_{2d})\approx 1+\xi_{1d}-\xi_{2d}$ is due to the noises of two detectors (denoting respectively ξ_{1d} and ξ_{1d}). The imaginary part of weak value can be an evidence for the EEP-coupling $|e\rangle\langle e|p^2$. If there is no such a coupling (i.e., replacing $|e\rangle\langle e|$ by the unit operator $\hat{1}$), the weak value $A_w^i=0$ and consequently the Eq. (36) is g_0 independent. In principle, when $g_0\omega_k tn^2A_w^i>\xi_{1d},\,\xi_{2d}$, the signal of g_0 should be detectable.

Both Eq. (34) and (35) indicating $g_0\omega_k t$ is a very crucial quantity for measuring the parameter g_0. Such a quality depends on k^2, so that using the high-frequency light scattering can significantly enhance the desired signal of g_0. Of course, $g_0t=\hbar\omega t/(mc^2)$ is the most basic quality. Where, the interaction duration t is limited within the coherent times of atomic qubit. Hence, the optical atom clocks are perhaps the good candidates for the relatively large g_0t gain, because they have both the quality of large transition frequency ω and long life-time t [48–50]. Considering the usually used transition ${}^1S_0-{}^3P_1$ of calcium clock, the resonant frequency and the life-time of excited state ${}^3P_1$ are respectively $\omega\approx 4.6\times10^{14}$ Hz and $t\approx 0.4$ ms [48], such that $g_0t\approx 3.2\times10^{-15}$ s. The relatively strong KD scattering occurs at the transition ${}^1S_0-{}^1P_1$ of calcium, and where the wave length of the driving light is on the order of $\lambda=2\pi/k\approx 0.4\,\mu$m. Using these parameters, we have $\omega_k\approx 1.6$ MHz and $g_0\omega_k t\approx 5\times10^{-9}$. Considering a KD scattering with $\eta=10$, the probability for finding momentum $|n=10\rangle$ is $J_{10}^2(\eta)=0.05$. As a consequence, $g_0\omega_k tn^2A_w^i\approx 5\times10^{-3}$ is obtained by selecting a large weak value $A_w^i=10^4$. Such a signal may be detectable if the noises ξ_{1d} and ξ_{2d} are smaller than 5×10^{-3}. Note that, the present weak measurement is also suitable for some other scattering mechanisms, for example, preparing the atomic initial state with more large momentum uncertainty by the multi-step scattering of lights. In principle, this will generate more significant effects of EEP than the present one.

V. CONCLUSION

In this theoretical work, we used the quantum weak measurement to detect the effects of EEP in the system of coherent atoms. First, we reviewed briefly the principle of weak measurement and its usefulness on the weak signal detections. Second, we present an approach to derive the dynamic evolution of an atom whose internal and external degrees of freedom are coupled due to the EEP. After a duration of such a coupling, the weak value is obtained by post-selecting an atomic internal state. It is shown that the imaginary part of weak value will change the momentum distribution of the selected atoms. This allowed us to measure the EEP effects in the momentum space of atoms. Third, we used the KD scattering to prepare and post-select the atoms (with the help of two single-qubit rotations). Preparing atomic momentum states by the light-induced scattering is optimal for measuring the coupling of $|e\rangle\langle e|\hat{p}^2$, because the scattering can generate a relative large momentum uncertainty of atoms. Certainly, observing the linear effect of EEP-coupling is still difficult by using even the advanced optical atoms clocks. Under this situation, the weak value is useful. It can significantly amplify the signals above the background noises, making the detection of weak signals becomes feasible. Finally, we hope the present studies will encourage further studies on the detection of weak signals.

Acknowledgements: This work was partly supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China Grants No. 11204249 and No. 11547311.

[1] Y. Aharonov, D. Z. Albert, and L. Vaidman, "How the result of a measurement of a component of the spin of a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particle can turn out to be 100", Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1351 (1988).

[2] R. Jozsa, "Complex weak values in quantum measurement", Phys. Rev. A **76**, 044103 (2007).

[3] J. Dressel and A. N. Jordan, "Significance of the imaginary part of the weak value", Phys. Rev. A **85**, 012107 (2012).

[4] M. F. Pusey, "Anomalous weak values are proofs of contextuality", Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 200401 (2014).

[5] J. S. Lundeen, B. Sutherland, A. Patel, C. Stewart, and C. Bamber, "Direct measurement of the quantum wavefunction", Nature **474**, 188 (2011).

[6] S. Kocsis, B. Braverman, S. Ravets, M. J. Stevens, R. P. Mirin, L. K. Shalm, and A. M. Steinberg, "Observing the average trajectories of single photons in a two-slit interferometer", Science **332**, 1170

(2011).

[7] J. S. Lundeen and A. M. Steinberg, "Experimental joint weak measurement on a photon pair as a probe of Hardy's paradox", Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 020404 (2009).

[8] J. Dressel, C. J. Broadbent, J. C. Howell, and A. N. Jordan, "Experimental violation of two-party Leggett-Garg inequalities with semiweak measurements", Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 040402 (2011).

[9] O. Hosten and P. Kwiat P, "Observation of the spin Hall effect of light via weak measurements", Science **319**, 787 (2008).

[10] Y. Aharonov, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, and P. Skrzypczyk, "Quantum Cheshire Cats", New J. Phys. **15**, 113015 (2013).

[11] T. Denkmayr, H. Geppert, S. Sponar, H. Lemmel, A. Matzkin, J. Tollaksen, and Y. Hasegawa, "Observation of a quantum Cheshire cat in a matter-wave interferometer experiment", Nat. Commun. **5**, 4492 (2014).

[12] N. Brunner, V. Scarani, M. Wegmüller, M. Legré, and N. Gisin, "Direct measurement of superluminal group velocity and signal velocity in an optical fiber", Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 203902 (2004).

[13] D. Rohrlich and Y. Aharonov, "Cherenkov radiation of superluminal particles", Phys. Rev. A **66**, 042102 (2002).

[14] M. V. Berry, "Superluminal speeds for relativistic random waves", J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45**, 185308 (2012).

[15] A. M. Steinberg, "How much time does a tunneling particle spend in the barrier region?", Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2405 (1995).

[16] P. B. Dixon, D. J. Starling, A. N. Jordan, and J. C. Howell, "Ultrasensitive beam deflection measurement via interferometric weak value amplification", Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 173601 (2009).

[17] O. S. Magaña-Loaiza, M. Mirhosseini, B. Rodenburg, and R. W. Boyd, "Amplification of angular rotations using weak measurements", Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 200401 (2014).

[18] S. Pang, J. Dressel, and T. A. Brun, "Entanglement-assisted weak value amplification", Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 030401 (2014).

[19] A. Feizpour, X. Xing, and A. M. Steinberg, "Amplifying single-photon nonlinearity using weak measurements", Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 133603 (2011).

[20] Y. Susa, Y. Shikano, and A. Hosoya, "Optimal probe wave function of weak-value amplification", Phys. Rev. A **85**, 052110 (2012).

[21] G. B. Alves, B. M. Escher, R. L. de Matos Filho, N. Zagury, and L. Davidovich "Weak-value amplifi-

cation as an optimal metrological protocol", Phys. Rev. A **91**, 062107 (2015).

[22] G. I. Viza, J. Martínez-Rincón, G. B. Alves, A. N. Jordan, and J. C. Howell, "Experimentally quantifying the advantages of weak-value-based metrology", Phys. Rev. A **92**, 032127 (2015).

[23] J. P. Torres and L. J. Salazar-Serrano, "Weak value amplification: a view from quantum estimation theory that highlights what it is and what isn't", arXiv: 1408.1919.

[24] J. Dressel, M. Malik, F. M. Miatto, A. N. Jordan, and R. W. Boyd, "Understanding quantum weak values: Basics and applications", Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 307 (2014).

[25] S. Sponar, T. Denkmayr, H. Geppert, H. Lemmel, A. Matzkin, J. Tollaksen, and Y. Hasegawa, "Weak values obtained in matter-wave interferometry", Phys. Rev. A **92**, 062121 (2015).

[26] O. Zilberberg, A. Romito, and Y. Gefen, "Charge sensing amplification via weak values measurement", Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 080405 (2011).

[27] D. Marian, N. Zanghì, and X. Oriols, "Weak values from displacement currents in multiterminal electron devices", Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 110404 (2016).

[28] I. Pikovski, M. Zych, F. Costa, and Č. Brukner, "Universal decoherence due to gravitational time dilation", Nat. Phys. **11**, 668 (2015).

[29] M. Zych, F. Costa, I. Pikovski, and Č. Brukner, "Quantum interferometric visibility as a witness of general relativistic proper time", Nat. Commun. **2**, 505 (2011).

[30] M. Zych and Č. Brukner, "Quantum formulation of the Einstein Equivalence Principle", arXiv:1502.00971.

[31] P. J. Orlando, R. B. Mann, K. Modi, and F. A. Pollock, "A simple test of the equivalence principle(s) for quantum superpositions", arXiv:1511.02943.

[32] J. C. Hafele and R. E. Keating, "Around-the-world atomic clocks: observed relativistic time gains", Science, **177**, 168 (1972).

[33] A. D. Cronin, J. Schmiedmayer, and D. E. Pritchard, "Optics and interferometry with atoms and molecules", Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1051 (2009).

[34] M. Zhang and S. Y. Zhu, "Application of the weak-measurement technique to study atom-vacuum interactions", Phys. Rev. A **92**, 043825 (2015).

[35] C. Ferrie and J. Combes, "Weak value amplification is suboptimal for estimation and detection", Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 040406 (2014).

[36] G. C. Knee and E. M. Gauger, "When amplification with weak values fails to suppress technical noise", Phys. Rev. X **4**, 011032 (2014).

[37] G. C. Knee, J. Combes, C. Ferrie, and E. M. Gauger, "Weak-value amplification: state of play", arXiv: 1410.6252.

[38] A. N. Jordan, J. Martínez-Rincón, and J. C. Howell, "Technical advantages for weak-value amplification: when less is more", Phys. Rev. X **4**, 011031 (2014).

[39] X. Zhu, Y. Zhang, S. Pang, C. Qiao, Q. Liu, and S. Wu, "Quantum measurements with preselection and postselection ", Phys. Rev. A **84**, 052111 (2011).

[40] H. Müller, A. Peters, and S. Chu, "A precision measurement of the gravitational redshift by the interference of matter waves", Nature, **463**, 926 (2010).

[41] H. Müeller, "Quantum mechanics, matter waves, and moving clocks", arXiv:1312.6449.

[42] J. Audretsch, U. Bleyer, and C. Lämmerzahl, "Testing Lorentz invariance with atomic-beam interferometry", Phys. Rev. A, **47**, 4632 (1993).

[43] L. Viola and R. Onofrio, "Testing the equivalence principle through freely falling quantum objects", Phys. Rev. D **55**, 455 (1997).

[44] S. Fray, C. A. Diez, T. W. Hänsch, and M. Weitz, "Atomic interferometer with amplitude gratings of light and its applications to atom based tests of the equivalence principle", Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 240404 (2004).

[45] S. Gupta, A. E. Leanhardt, A. D. Cronin, and D. E. Pritchard, "Coherent manipulation of atoms with standing light waves", C. R. Acad. Sci., Ser. IV Phys. **2**, 479 (2001).

[46] P. L. Gould, G. A. Ruff, and D. E. Pritchard, "Diffraction of atoms by light: the near-resonant Kapitza-Dirac effect", Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 827 (1986).

[47] Yu. B. Ovchinnikov, J. H. Müller, M. R. Doery, E. J. D. Vredenbregt, K. Helmerson, S. L. Rolston, and W. D. Phillips, "Diffraction of a released Bose-Einstein condensate by a pulsed standing light wave", Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 284 (1999).

[48] F. Riehle, Th. Kisters, A. Witte, J. Helmcke, and Ch. J. Bordé, "Optical Ramsey spectroscopy in a rotating frame: Sagnac effect in a matter-wave interferometer", Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 177 (1991).

[49] A. D. Ludlow, M. M. Boyd, and J. Ye, "Optical atomic clocks", Rev. Mod. Phys. **87**, 637 (2015).

[50] T. Binnewies, G. Wilpers, U. Sterr, F. Riehle, J. Helmcke, T. E. Mehlstäubler, E. M. Rasel, and W. Ertmer, "Doppler cooling and trapping on forbidden transitions", Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 123002 (2001).